

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claim 9 has been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

In view of the objection to claim 9, amendment has been made to correct the informalities specified in the Office Action. The amendment to claim 9 is made only to correct a minor informality. The amendment is not made in response to the rejections or to comply with any statutory requirement of patentability, since no such amendments are believed to be necessary.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Independent claims 1, 12, 13, 22 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on U.S. Patent no. 5,991,810, Shapiro et al. ("Shapiro"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method, comprising:
automatically configuring a server so that the server is able to communicate with a database to authenticate a user; and
operating the server.
(Emphasis added).

The above claim recites a method of automatically configuring a server so that the server can communicate with a database to authenticate a user. Thus, the automatic configuration is done to the server, not the database; and the configured server communicates with the database in a task of authenticating a user.

Although Shapiro teaches a proxy cache server (Figure 1 Element 50 & column 7 lines 16-17 and column 7 lines 36-40) and discusses user authentication, its discussion is focused on and limited to a particular method of user authentication, not a process of automatic configuration of the proxy cache server to communicate with a database to allow authentication.

For example, the particular method of user authentication described in Shapiro as shown in Figure 2 is to make a call from the client (A) to the NDS server (C) instructing the NDS server to retrieve an NDS format user name for the particular client user from storage 46 (Column 4, lines 30-37). If a NDS format user name is retrieved, the client user is authenticated; otherwise, authentication fails (Column 4, line 64 – column 5, line1). The related method of authentication does not involve any communication between the proxy cache server and the NDS server on behalf of the storage, nor does it describe any process of automatic configuration on the proxy cache server to enable such communication.

Furthermore, the language of claim used in Shapiro (Column 7, lines 36-40) relied on by the Examiner in rejecting claim 1 of the present invention describes the authorization process (“determining whether access to the requested information is permitted or denied based upon predetermined access parameters associated with the remote site and the context of the client”), a different process from authentication, which determines whether the user requesting access is who he claims to be.

Thus, because Shapiro does not teach or claim a method to automatically configure a server so that the server is able to communicate with a database in authenticating a user, claim 1 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Shapiro.

Similarly, claims 12, 13, 22 and 26 all recite the limitation of automatically configuring a network cache and other limitations. Thus, at least for the same reasons discussed above, claim 12, 13, 22, 26 and all claims which depend on them are also patentable over Shapiro.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Independent claims 1, 12, 13, 22 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on U.S. Patent no. 6,687,733, Manukyan (“Manukyan”).

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner alleges that Manukyan teaches the method recited in claim 1. The Examiner further refers to Manukyan’s Abstract and column 17 lines 13-17 & lines 33-36 as the relevant part of discussion of the method. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and disagrees.

Manukyan concerns a process of authorization, not authentication. Authentication determines a user’s identity, whereas authorization determines whether the user has the right to access certain requested information or to perform certain functions. Although Manukyan discusses authentication information (Figure 5, Element 90 and columns 15-16), nowhere does it discuss the process of configuring a server for the purpose of authentication. Rather, Manukyan concerns how to make the process easier in making services available to a particular client in view of the client’s account setup.

In addition, Manukyan does not teach or suggest configuring a server to enable the server’s communication with a database for authentication. Manukyan teaches an interactive server, which communicates with a database and runs a server daemon to make a service available to a client (Abstract). The automatic configuration process discussed in Manukyan is to create or change predetermined system configuration files corresponding to any client account

change (Column 3, lines 8-16 & lines 19-22 and column 19, lines 6-10 & lines 32-41). Based on the predetermined system configuration files, the server daemon determines what services are available to a particular client. Thus, the predetermined system configuration files can be considered as an ACL (Access Control List), which constitutes a “database” communicating with the server daemon to determine to which service a client has access.

The above determination of Manukyan is further supported by its own discussion at column 10 from line 36 to line 56. There, Manukyan states that configuration files used to control the manner in which services will be available to a client, or to control verification or authentication function, form a part of the predetermined system configuration files; and these files are modified, as necessary, based upon the settings of the account desired or specified by the client. Thus, the configuration process in Manukyan is done to a database (the ACL created based on clients’ account information), not the interactive server or the server daemon. By contrast, the configuration recited in claim 1 of the present invention is done to the server, not the database.

Thus, because Manukyan does not teach each and every limitation of claim 1, claim 1 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Manukyan.

Similarly, claims 12, 13, 22 and 26 all recite the limitation of automatically configuring a network cache. Thus, at least for the same reasons discussed above, claim 12, 13, 22, 26 and all claims which depend on them are also patentable over Manukyan.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Independent claims 10 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on U.S. Patent no. 6,321,259 Quellette et al. (“Quellette”) in view of Manukyan. Applicant respectfully

traverses the rejections and submit that the Examiner has not met the burden to establish a *prima facie* case under § 103(a), at least for the reason that Quellette and Manukyan do not teach or suggest individually or in combination all the claim limitations of claims 10 and 21, even assuming *arguendo* that Quellette teaches the listed limitations, as the Examiner alleges on Page 6 of the Office Action.

Claim 10 recites:

10. A method for automatically configuring a network cache, the method comprising:
 - receiving as input from a user interface a user ID of a user object located in a database;
 - querying the database for the user ID;
 - outputting to the user interface objects having the user ID;
 - receiving a selection of the user object to associate with the user ID;
 - retrieving the user object;
 - outputting to the user interface attributes of the user object ;
 - receiving a selection of an attribute name associated with the user ID within the user object;
 - storing the attribute name associated with the user ID in a configuration file in the network cache;**
 - receiving a selection of the attribute names associated with one or more group ID's within the user object;
 - storing the attribute names associated with the one or more group ID's in a configuration file in the network cache;**
 - receiving a selection of an object other than the user object having the user ID;
 - retrieving the object;
 - receiving a selection of the attribute names associated with the attributes utilized to identify the non-parent group; and
 - storing the attribute names in a configuration file in the network cache.**
- (Emphasis added).

The Examiner admits that Quellette does not disclose expressly “storing the attribute names in a configuration file in the network cache”, but contends that Manukyan does. In supporting his contention, the Examiner points to Manukyan’s Abstract lines 1-10, column 17 lines 13-27 & lines 33-36, column 18 lines 41-44 and column 19 lines 6-10 & lines 33-41, and alleges that “network cache is considered as a collective entity of Controller and Interactive Server Daemon” (Office Action, page 7 at para. 3).

Even assuming *arguendo* that a network cache is considered as a collective entity of Controller and Interactive Server Daemon, Manukyan does not teach or suggest storing the attribute names in a configuration file in the network cache. As discussed above, the essence of Manukyan's configuration process is to construct an ACL based on attributes of clients' account. That is, storing attribute values in the predetermined configuration files, whereas claim 10 of the present invention stores attribute names in a configuration file. Even if attribute names are present in the predetermined configuration files in Manukyan, they are preset and fixed in the files and, therefore, storing them is unnecessary during Manukyan's automatic configuration process. In contrast, storing attribute names is part of the automatic configuration process recited in claim 10.

In sum, because Manukyan and Quellette do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 10, claim 10 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over the cited arts.

For the same reasons, because claim 21 includes a similar limitation of storing attribute names, claim 21 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over the cited arts.

Dependent Claims


In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 8/15/05


Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 48102
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300